

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse all of the Examiner's claim rejections under 35 USC 103. In reply the Amendment filed by Applicants on May 24, 2005, the Examiner has cited US patent no. 5,983,227 to Nazem et al., in combination with the previously relied upon AAPA, Lowery, Greenwood, and Anuff references, in rejecting all of Applicants' amended claims.

Interview with Examiner Sain

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during an interview with Applicants' attorney. During that interview, Applicants' invention was discussed in relation to the Nazem et al. reference. As understood, Applicants' pending claims, as amended on May 24, 2005, are distinguished from the previously relied upon references. Applicants' attorney set forth clear distinctions between Applicants' invention and the teachings particularly of Nazem et al. Applicants' attorney described substantially what is set forth below regarding these distinctions between Applicants' invention and the teachings particularly of Nazem et al.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 2, 16, 17, 30, 31, 33, 46, 47 and 61-84 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Lowery, in further view of Nazem et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites receiving a single request specifying multiple content components derived from content hosted by a plurality of distinct component servers,

generating a plurality of requests for the content as parallel worker threads spawned from a main execution thread, and sending each of the plurality of requests to the component servers before receiving any response, thereby permitting concurrent generation of the content components at the component servers. A personalized network page is assembled and transmitted. As understood, no combination of AAPA, Lowery nor Nazem et al. teaches or suggests this feature.

As the Examiner concedes that neither AAPA nor Lowery teach or suggest this feature, the following refers particularly to the Nazem reference, and particularly to the illustration at Figure 2 and associated text descriptions in the specification of Nazem et al. Nazem et al. teach a shared memory 212 for collecting content components from multiple data sources 230, 232 and 234. Nazem et al. does not discuss the temporal details of how the shared memory 212 receives data from the data sources 230, 232 and 234. The feature expounded by Nazem et al. as being advantageous is the page generator 210 being capable of calling a web page from the shared memory 212. The web page is assembled and stored at the shared memory 212 using a template and the data received from the multiple data sources 230, 232, and 234. At column 4, lines 6-7, Nazem specifically states that this "allows for quick recovery should a page server crash".

An advantage of Applicants' invention is that the requested data is retrieved from each of the component servers very soon after a request is received from a client, e.g., client 518A of Applicants' Figure 5. The second element of Applicants' claim 1 recites specifically "After receiving the single request, generating a plurality of information requests for the content" This feature of Applicants' invention permits the assembly of a network page that has very fresh data.

Nazem et al., on the other hand, teach to retrieve the latest page that has already been assembled at the shared memory 212. This implies that the data used was retrieved from data sources 230, 232, 234 some time before a client request for the web page. For example, data might be retrieved periodically, e.g., every 15 minutes, from one or more of the data sources 230, 232 and/or 234. Thus, a page would sit, fully assembled and ready to be provided in response to a request, for up to 15 minutes before the page is updated with new data. During those 15 minutes, a client may request and receive the page with the data that was retrieved from the data sources up to 15 minutes ago and in any event before receiving the request from the client. Thereafter, the page might be automatically refreshed every 15 minutes, or upon manual execution of a refresh process. Even then, there is no teaching or suggestion in Nazem et al. to generate the multiple requests for multiple content components as parallel worker threads spawned from a main execution thread.

Claims 3, 13-15, 18, 28-30, 33, 43-45, 48 and 58-60 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Lowery, in view Nazem et al. and in further view of Greenwood. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, and submit that each of claims 3, 13-15, 18, 28-30, 33, 43-45, 48 and 58-60 are allowable for the same reasons as previously described.

Claims 4-12, 19-27, 34-42, and 49-57 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Lowery, in view Nazem et al. and in further view of Greenwood, and in further view of Anuff. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, and submit that each of claims 4-12, 19-27, 34-42, and 49-57 are allowable for the same reasons as previously described.

Appl. No. 10/077,423
Amendment dated January 9, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed August 1, 2005

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 07-1896. A duplicate page is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP

Dated: January 9, 2006

By



Andrew V. Smith
Reg. No. 43,132
Attorney for Applicant

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP
153 Townsend Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94107
Telephone: 415-836-2522
Facsimile: 415-836-2501

Customer No.: 29585